The Friday Barth

The Friday Barth

Isono Arai

1 "Less Is Less" / "Less Is More" / "More Is More"

In 1986, two years after the publication of his *The Friday Book*, John Barth writes an essay about minimalism, "A Few Words About Minimalism," which was to be collected as one of the Friday-pieces in a second volume of "*The Friday Book.*" In the 1980s a new literary phenomenon called minimalism began to rise in the American literary world. Viewed in the historical context, every new phenomenon or movement in every era rises as a reaction against, or as a challenge to, the former era, and the new movements which appeared in their ages will become a part of the history of the world as well as create it. Minimalism in the 1980s American literature can be regarded as a new phenomenon against, or defamilializing phenomenon of, the prominent literary movement of the 1960s, which brought about various experimental literary movements, called "Black Humor," "Surfiction," etc.

What has brought the minimalist movement about? What has happened in the 1980s? What does Barth, a prominent writer from the sixties, think about minimalism in the 1980s? Why does he take

the stand on maximalism whose vector goes the opposite direction to minimalism? His essay on minimalism will give us some important key to understanding his situation at present and to anticipate his future development. In this section I examine three points, based on his essay, "A Few Words About Minimalism." They are as follows: first, the characteristics of minimalism in the 1980s; secondly, causes of the minimalism phenomenon; and lastly, his maximalism in contrast to minimalism.

In his essay on minimalism Barth makes two major points: minimalism in the 1980s and its antecedents. He defines the minimalism phenomenon in the 1980s as "the new flowering of the American short story (in particular the kind of terse, oblique, realistic or hyperrealistic, slightly plotted, extrospective, cool-surfaced fiction associated in the last 5 or 10 years...and both praised and damned under such labels as 'K-Mart realism,' 'hick sic,' 'Diet-Pepsi minimalism' and 'post-Vietnam, post-literary postmodernist blue-collar neoearly-Hemingwayism')."[1] From his definition in a lecture on the recent American novel, "The American New Novel" lectured in 1982, the features of minimalists' works in the 1980s are short, realistic, simple, extrospective stories.[2] Turning his attention to the label of the contemporary literary phenomenon, "minimalism," he argues that a memorable specimen of minimalism is expressed in the motto of minimal art, "Less is More," and that as an idea there is nothing particularly new here. For example, proverbs, epigrams, mottoes, slogans, and the palindrome are popular minimalist genres in every century.

Within the historical context of American literature Barth reconstructs the tradition of minimalism from the nineteenth century

through the 1920s to the 1960s, mentioning the names of the writers like Edgar Allan Poe, Henry James, Ernest Hemingway, and Donald Barthelme. Poe's distinction of the genre of the short story is an early manifesto of modern narrative minimalism. His codification informs terseness, selectivity and implicitness as opposed to leisurely once-upon-a-timelessness and luxuriant abundance. James said, "Show, don't tell." Hemingway described his "new theory" in the early 1920's: "You could omit anything if you knew that you omitted, and the omitted part would strengthen the story and make people feel something more than they understood." And, "the modern tradition of literary minimalism...continues in such next-generation writers as in America, Donald Barthelme ('The fragment is the only form I trust,' says a character in his slender novel 'Snow White')." [3]

In Twentieth-century literature, Barth claims, the succession to minimalists leads to the shorter *ficciones* of Jorge Luis Borges and the ever-terser texts of Samuel Beckett. I agree with Barth on the point that the traditions of minimalism, in the sense of "Less is More" in art, leads from Poe through Hemingway to Donald Barthelme, and that the great masters of "Less is More" in the twentieth-century literature are Borges and Beckett. To these writers simplification is a device used to heighten the effects of their literary worlds. However, does the tradition of minimalism, in the sense of "Less is More" in art, really continue, through Borges, Beckett and Donald Barthelme, to the "newly notable younger U.S. realist/minimalist short story writers" in the 1980s, as Barth insists? Although the labels are the same, the minimalism of Borges and Beckett and that of the 1980s short story writers seem somehow different in their attitudes. Why? If these two minimalisms are different types, how

are they different? What is the weak point of Barth's minimalism theory? Isn't he a little too strongly influenced by the label "minimalism" with respect to the phenomenon in the 1980s? He develops his minimalism theory on the base of the Minimalist movement in art, especially the idea "Less is More." Let us make a brief examination of minimalism in art, and then the mutual relationship between art and literature as historical phenomena.

The word, "minimalism," is derived, as Barth points out, from the modern art movement. It is a phenomenon that arose in modern art around the 1920s, and its leading school is a Bauhaus school of design at Weimar.[4] The attitude of minimal art expressed in its trial "to shed everything extraneous to the aesthetic process, and perhaps most of that process itself."[5] The artistic prowess of Minimalists in modern art is based on the idea that the less they announce their art on the surface of their artifacts, the more artistic an impression they are able to give the spectator. The motto of Minimalists in modern art is "Less is More."

"Less is More" is somehow magical. The artifacts of minimalism aim at a sort of magical effect. "Less is More" can be thought of as a magical device of the Minimalists in modern art. If we examine the magical device in literary history, we will find that Poe, Hemingway, Borges and Beckett achieve great success by using the magical device: Barth is right with that point. Minimalism in art and minimalism in literature from Poe to Borges holds the same attitude and effect.

In order to classify and properly understand new literary movements or phenomena critics tend to apply words that have been used for naming characteristic phenomena in the fine arts and

architecture. In this respect "magic realism" is no exception. The term is now used in literature to describe the works of such Latin American authors as Borges, García Márquez and Italo Calvino. In magic realist novels and stories realism mingles with the unexpected inexplicable elements of dreams, fairy-tales, and mythology which combine with the everyday life in a mosaic of refraction and recurrence. The term "Magic Realism" is adopted from the field of modern art. It is a term coined by Franz Roh to describe the works of German artists of the *neue Sachlichkeit* (new objectivity). Their characteristics are "clear, cool, static, thinly-painted, sharp-focus images, frequently portraying the imaginary, the improbable, or the fantastic in a realistic or rational manner."[6] Magic Realism in literature has some affinity with the neo-Gothic which is an expression also adopted from descriptive expressions found in art and architecture.

In his paper, "Magicking the Real: Paradoxes of Postmodern Writing," Lori Chamberlain examines the traditions of magic realism in American literature. Owing to his definition of magic realism in literature, magic realist fiction is "propelled by the tension between realistic elements and fabulous, magical, or fantastic elements," and that it tends "toward a sharp focus on objects to make them appear more than real."[7] Chamberlain reconstructs the traditions of magic realism in American literature from the 19th century to the 1960s. The tradition for magic realism begins with the Gothic tales of Poe and the romances of Hawthorne. They are torn by contradictions similar to those magic realism; their imaginative view of the world are informed by an irrational powers of the individual a sort of mystical unity of the world of nature and the world of the spirit. In the modernist period the tradition of magic realism is carried on in two

streams, the first is traditional magic realism that is indebted to the traditions of romance, Gothicism, and the baroque, and the second is sometimes referred to as the new objectivity where sharply focused attention to detail renders the familiar strange. Chamberlain finds these two types of magic realism in the works of both William Faulkner and Hemingway: "one of the precursors to such new objectivity in the American literary tradition is Ernest Hemingway. Where Faulkner projects the psychological dimensions of his characters into the language of description, Hemingway attempts to repress that dimension, focusing instead on the minute details of an objective world. The force of that repression, however, magnifies or distorts that object, making it seem more than real."[8] In the tradition of American literature Hemingway stands on the intersection between magic realism and minimalism. Magic realism in the postmodern period is represented by the so called "Fabulists," Chamberlain argues: "Although American writers have consistently been working within the aesthetics of magic realism in the contemporary period, their writing has not always been so labeled. ...Fabulism, an alternative to the realist novel, is closely linked to romance, satire, and fable," and "the paradigmatic authors" are "Kurt Vonnegut, John Hawkes, and John Barth."[9]

Central movements or phenomena in every period illustrate the interrelationships between the field of literature and that of painting. In the postmodern period for example, as Jerome Klinkowitz suggests, "action painting suggests action writing, and action writing is just what the self-reflexive novelists...were attempting in the 1960s."[10] Here is one critical point. When a term used in some field is adopted in another field, the term is likely to have a different sense. Such is

the fate of the word: a word that pertains to the dual aspects of concept and of sound-image—or, to use the terms which Saussure's work has made well-known—the signified and the signifier. While the signifier of a word is always the same, that signified by the word conveys a different nuance in a different time, situation, or context. In the field of art and painting the term "minimalism" is used in the sense of "Less is More." In literature the term is used with different meanings in different periods: until the 1960s Minimalism, or "Less is More," means "literature of silence," as Ihab Hassan finds the representatives in Beckett and Henry Miller; or it means "the retreat from the word," as George Steiner claims, taking as an example Beckett's *Act Without Words*.[11] In other words what is being indicated is "talkativeness of silence." Minimalism or "Less is More" can be found in literature at the crossroads of minimalism in art and magic realism. The number of words are less, but they indicate more. This tradition of "Less is More" can be followed in such authors' works as Poe, Hemingway, and Donald Barthelme through Borges and Beckett. In British literature its tradition leads in the 1980s to such authors as Salman Rushdie with his representative short story, "The Prophet's Hair," and Angela Carter, the author of "Fresh and the Mirror": they are magic realistic works in the 1980s.[12] What about American literature in the 1980s?

Although Barth also finds minimalism or "Less is More" in the works of younger writers in the 1980s called "minimalists," their minimalism seems definitely different from the precursors' "Less is More" in the "signified" sense. The sound-image of the term, "minimalism," is the same in the period up to the 1960s and the period of the 1980s, but the concept is different in both periods. In the period

up to the 1960s "Less is More," while in the period of 1980s minimalism seems to mean "Less is Less." Carol Iannone gives a definition of minimalism in the 1980s in her essay, "The Fiction We Deserve": "minimalism: fiction that is thin in texture, slight in form, banal in subject matter, well-crafted, empty, easy to read—in short, literature for the age of television."[13] Minimalism in the 1980s does not inherit the characteristics of "Less is More." It is "Less is Less." Barth does not find that difference. That is a blind spot of his minimalism theory. He seems to stick to the label, "minimalism," too much. From where does the difference come between minimalism till the 1960s and minimalism in the 1980s? What caused the minimalist phenomenon in the 1980s? What happened in the 1980s? Why did it happen? What developments does Barth see as important? In order to answer these questions it will be necessary to clarify the blind point in his minimalism theory.

Why did he confuse the minimalism of "Less is More" and minimalism in the 1980s? To answer that question, let us examine the causes of minimalism in the 1980s in his theory. He points out the basic causes of minimalism: and they occur as follow, in order.

1. Our national hangover from the Vietnam War, felt by many to be a trauma literally and figuratively unspeakable.
2. The coincident energy crisis of 1973–76, and the associated reaction against American excess and wastefulness.
3. The national decline in reading and writing skills.
4. Along with this decline, an ever-dwindling readerly attention span.
5. Together with all the above, a reaction on these authors' part against the ironic, black-homoristic "fabulism" and/or the intel-

lectuality and/or the density, here byzantine, there baroque, of some of their immediate American antecedents.

6. The reaction against the all but inescapable hyperbole of American Advertising, both commercial and political, with its high-tech manipulativeness and glamorous lies.

To be more specific with respect to the 2nd and 6th examples, the American excesses in the 1980s is being caused by the cult of information facilitated by the personal computer's widespread diffusion among the general public. In his *The Cult of Information* Theodore Roszak states that since the late 1960s the computer provides a major service to the production of excessive information.[14]

As the cause of the general decline in basic language skills in the 1980s, No.3, Barth indicates that books have given way to television: "narrative-dramatic entertainment and tastes [of even teachers] come far more from movies and television than from literature.... Rarely in their [writers' in graduate writing programs] own writing will one find a sentence of any syntactical complexity, for example, and inasmuch as a language's repertoire of other-than-basic thoughts and feelings...." The fact that Barth thinks the general decline in letters these days is a critical problem is reflected in the Genie's problem in his work, *Chimera:*

> He was a writer of tales, he said — anyhow a former writer of tales — in a land on the other side of the world. At one time, we gathered, people in his country had been fond of reading; currently, however, the only readers of artful fiction were critics, other writers, and unwilling students who, left to themselves preferred music and pictures to words.[15]

Along with the national decline in reading and writing skills, Barth argues as an explanation to No.4 that "we bourgeois now spends with our televisions and video cassette recorders. ...the large-circulation magazine market for fiction had dwindled to a handful of outlets." Now the age has come that Tony Tanner foresaw in 1971, "the printing age is now giving way to the electronic age."[16]

As Larry McCaferry writes in the introduction of *Postmodern Fiction* minimalism in the 1980s is thought to be a reaction against the experimental fiction in the 1960s: "authors today are less interested in innovation per se than they were ten or fifteen years ago.... For one thing, the experimental fever that seemed to sustain postmodernism for several years has been subjected to repeated counterattacks by authors and critics."[17] In a sense, the condition of society in the 1980s is characterized by a kind of saturation. The time to defamilialize the literature of excess from the 1960s has come. Charles Newman explains experimental fiction in the 1960s vs. minimalism in the 1980s in his essay on minimalism, "What's Left Out of Literature":

> The self-conscious mode that drove so much interesting fiction for the last 20 years is no longer with us.... This writing was congealed under the rubrics of 'self-reflexivity' and 'Fabulism,' just as the younger writers today are lumped together under 'minimalism' and 'dirty realism.' Labels aside, what one notices in John Barth...is that no character ever talks the way most people actually do, and the presumption is that in fiction that is how it should be. In minimal fiction, there has never been such a conscious and largely successful attempt to capture in dialogue the elisions and inadvertent rhythms of everyday colloquial speech.[18]

Newman goes on in his examination about the plain style of new realism as a dual reaction against both the mannerism of the self-conscious mode *and* commercial fiction, which has always been defined by its peppy style and abundance of information. On one hand Barth admits that a reaction against fabulists is one of the causes of minimalism: "fabulists' characteristic material, angle of attack and resultant flavor are different indeed. The formal intricacy...or the direct though satirical intellectuality...are as foreign to the K-Mart Realists." On the other hand, he warns: "The dialogue between fantasist and realist, fabulator and quotidianist, like the dialogue between maximalist and minimalist, is as old as story-telling, and by no means always adversary. There are innumerable combinations, coalitions, line-crossing and workings of both sides of the street." Barth criticizes the way of looking at minimalism as a simple binomial opposition to maximalism. He concludes his essay on minimalism as follows: "As between minimalism and its opposite, I pity the reader — or the writer, or the age — too addicted to either to savor the other."

Owing to Barth's minimalism theory and other critics' theories in the 1980s, five sixth of the causes of minimalism phenomenon in the 1980s were social factors. Minimalism in the 1980s reflects the social conditions of America. Different from minimalism in the 1980s, minimalism in the 1960s is deeply rooted, artistic movement. Minimalistic literature within the traditions of American literature is strongly influenced by innovative movements in art and painting rather than the social conditions in each period. Literature characterlized by "Less is More" reflects artistic phenomenon, not the social condition and thesis the point which Barth's theory of minimalism

lacks. Under the same label, "minimalism," there are closely different causes between the minimalism of "Less is More" and minimalism in the 1980s. He should expose these. Let us examine them in order to understand the differences between them more clearly and try to complete his presently deficient minimalism theory.

To see minimalism in the 1980s more clearly, let us examine it in contrast to the former period, the period of maximalism in the 1960s. McCaferry states that a book like Barth's *Letters* is operating on some different aesthetic principles than Carver's. Barth's and Pynchon's mammoth, encyclopaedic narratives aim at devising grand, multi-layered structures that can deal with contemporary experience through a wide range of allusions, symbols, and language forms. Meanwhile, Carver's minimalist fiction approaches the problem of capturing a sense of contemporary life from a different direction: its focus on the small, unarticulated mysterious of daily life and its pared-down prose are features of nontraditional vision, one that seeks a means of capturing the emptiness, the bewilderment and misguided illuminations, of Carver's ordinary characters.[19] Minimal fictions represented by such works as Carver's in the 1980s is, in a sense, "Less is Less," not "Less is More."

On the contrary, minimalistic works like Borges and Beckett in the 1960s can be regarded as belonging to the "Less is More" category of literature. We could say that minimalism represents one side of a coin while maximalism the other. Referring to such minimalists in the 1960s as Donald Barthelme and Beckett, Frederic R. Karl regards them as minimalists of the "Interature of silence": the 1960s and 1970s have produced a small body of minimalists. "In their works the reader is aware of the space between words, the pauses

between breath, the silence between noises.... Beckett attempted to replace words with silence, and silence, as we shall see, are leitmotifs in minimalism. Echoes, mirrors, images based on reflection and doubling become like a 'second voice' in the novels of minimalism."[20] Karl suggests that there is a trick in minimalists' works in the 1960s where silence conceal innumerable words and phrases: "The trick with minimalist fiction is, a variation of this, tipping off the reader that the artist is conscious of what is being omitted. The minimalist writer must assure the audience that he, the writer, knows far more about the subject than he is including; that beyond him, in some spatial realm, there is the rest, undefined perhaps, but *there*." Minimalist fiction in the 1960s contains this trick, but minimalist works in the 1980s do not. They are simple, their surfaces are cool, and that which one sees, one receives.

In sum, minimalism in the 1960s is a movement that depends upon the artistic minimalism movement; that means "Less is More," or the "literature of silence"; that is a complex minimalism which pastes maximalism on the one hand and that is a literature of low-fat and high-protein delights. On the other hand, minimalism in the 1980s arises from the influence of the social conditions of that period; that is "Less is Less," the surface tells all; that it is a simple minimalism which hides nothing under its cool-surface; and that it is a literature of low-fat and low-protein rewards is evident.

Barth, a representative maximalist, declares in his minimalism essay his neutrality between minimalism and maximalism. Keeping this in mind, if we were to seek the minimalistic character in his works, it would be the Beckettian sense of minimalism, not the minimalism of the 1980s. He writes a suggestive sentence in his "Anonymiad"

in *Lost in the Funhouse*, a collection of fourteen short stories: a writer of the short story as a character in it says, "Even so, much is left unsaid, much must be blank."[21] Barth himself indicates in *The Friday Book* that language makes one coin together with silence as the opposite side: "Language after all consists of silence as well as sound, and...the language of action consists of rest as well as movement."[22] Even though Barth himself declares his neutrality, he has no objection in regarding himself as a talkative author. His encyclopaedic works give the reader the high-fat, high-calorie, and high-protein delicious delights. The real taste of his works depend upon his spirit of "More is More."

2 Exhaustion/Replenishment: The Postmodern Spirit

The discussion in the section will focus on two of Barth's essays, different in their conception and then both collected in *The Friday Book*: "The Literature of Exhaustion" (1967) and "The Literature of Replenishment" (1979); both essays appeared originally in *The Atlantic*. These two are a pair of complementary studies in postmodernism and we know with them Barth's attitudes toward writing and literature, admittedly in a fragmentary fashion. Why does he write the stories he writes the way he writes them rather than some other sort of stories in some other way? What kind of literary philosophy does he have and why does he have it? We look here at Barth's postmodern spirit.

When he reprints his essay "The Literature of Exhaustion" in *The Friday Book*, he notes that the essay is misread by many critics as one more Death of the Novel or Swan-Song of Literature Piece,

though it isn't, and that his main argument in the essay is that virtuosity is a virtue.[1] Why has the essay been misread? Barth suggests that the word he uses in the title of the essay, "exhaustion," is misunderstood in its meaning as death. Indeed, for example, Martina Sciolino misreads it and says, "The literature of exhaustion literally displays built-in-obsolescence."[2] In the introduction of his *Passionate Virtuosity: The Fiction of John Barth*, Charles B. Harris makes a misexplanation about "The Literature of Exhaustion" that Barth's main contention in the essay is contemporary writers' dilemma, the usedupness of literary forms, and as the result, literature come to a crisis.[3] Tom LeClair misinterprets the essay where Barth argues the death of genres, forms, and styles of literature.[4] Why do those critics misread the word, "exhaustion"?

Exhaustion is a theme in American society in the 1960s. As early as 1960 Arthur Schlesinger predicts a social state of exhaustion. He traces back the origin of this exhausted state to the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties. He argues that the political mood of exhaustion produced by the depression in the thirties, the wars in the forties, and by the politics of fatigue in the fifties results in the social mood of exhaustion in the sixties.[5] Beneath the social mood of exhaustion there lies in hiding the spirit of the counter-culture of the sixties. It is this spirit that produces the base for the postmodern aggressive spirit. We can find it in Barth's attitudes to experimentalism. Exhaustion goes hand in hand with experimentalism and even the politics are exhausted but literature can never be exhausted. In this sense, his protest against the misreading of "The Literature of Exhaustion" is understandable. In his later essay, "The Literature of Replenishment," he warns that "literature can never be exhausted—

its 'meaning' residing as it does in its transactions with individual readers over time, space, and language."[6]

His experimental spirit toward writing is expressed in his statement "virtuosity is a virtue." In "The Literature of Exhaustion" he insists on the importance of technically up-to-date art and this is a crucial point in his thesis:

> However, art and its forms and techniques live in history and certainly do change. I sympathize with a remark attributed to Saul Bellow, that to be technically up-to-date is the least important attribute of a writer — though I would add that this least important attribute may be nevertheless essential. In any case, to be technically *out* of date is likely to be a genuine defect: Beethoven's Sixth Symphony or the Chartres cathedral, if executed today, might be simply embarrassing.[7]

In an interview Barth also emphasizes with the importance of being contemporary: "if I were a composer, I would try to find a way to be absolutely contemporary, insofar as my musical means are concerned."[8] We should not misinterpret that he argues the importance of technique; not technique but the experimental posture that he regards as important. He says in another interview, "The permanent changes in fiction from generation to generation more often have been, and are more likely to be, modifications of sensibility and attitude rather than dramatic innovations in form and technique."[9] It is not simply to have experimental means but to be experimental in attitude that is important. One must first be experimental in spirit, then the spirit goes on to be expressed in the medium of fiction writing. Barth finds this experimental spirit in Borges, and calls it "the Borgesian spirit." Barth claims that Borges is an ideal technically

up-to-date artist because of his experimental attitude and sensibility: "Borges, Beckett and Nabokov have experimented with form and technique and even with the *means* of fiction, working with graphics and tapes and things," but even among these the important issue is "more a matter of sensibility and attitude than of means."

Barth's spirit to be up-to-date both in attitude and in the means of writing leans his theory of literature whereby within the history of literature the leading current is not realism but "irrealism": "unlike those critics who regard realism as what literature has been aiming at all along, I tend to regard it as a kind of aberration in the history of literature."[10] His negative attitude toward realism comes from not only his experimental spirit—he says, "I am interested in formal experimentation"—but also his admired artist, Borges, who sets forth "irrealism" and carries it out in his fiction. Irrealists disclose the fiction of reality with fictional devices, mainly, by "contamination of reality by dream." It is one of the favorite fictional devices of Borges, Barth mentions: "This 'contamination of reality by dream,' as Borges calls it, is one of his pet themes, and commentary upon such contaminations is one of his favorite fictional devices."[11] In another Friday-piece Barth explains other fictional devices used by Borges: "In the opinion of Jorge Luis Borges, the most ubiquitous devices of fantastic literature are four: the double, the voyage in time, the contamination of reality by irreality and the text within the text."[12] These fictional devices are experimental means of technically up-to-date artists. Barth is greatly affected by the Borgesian spirit, and, needless to say, he is a magician himself in using those devices. For example, Fred Moramarco admires Barth who has directed his "major creative energies toward revolutionalizing the aesthetic con-

ventions of [his] art."[13]

Borges becomes an important influence on experimental American writers in the sixties called "New Writers," "Black Humorists," "Fabulators," and various other names. Tony Tanner mentions Borges's influence on the American writers: "A part of the appeal that Borges has for American writers is his sense that 'reality' is an infinitely plural affair, that there are many different worlds and that the intersection points might not be so fixed as some people think, that the established ways in which we classify and order reality are as much 'fictions' as his stories."[14] Tanner states that Borges is at the base of the experimental movement in the American Sixties. Borges's fictional devices, for example, mirrors, labyrinth, contamination of reality by dream, and metafictional form, are used by Barth in different ways. We can find Borgesian devices in most of Barth's works. Funhouse in *Lost in the Funhouse* is a labyrinth of mirrors; metafictional form is typical in his fiction; *Sabbatical* and *The Tidewater Tales* consists of a sequence of contamination of reality by dreams.

In "The Literature of Exhaustion" Barth's central target for Borges's fictional devices is his use of parody. Barth mentions Borges's short story "Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote," which Barth admires. The story is a parody of Cervantes's novel *Don Quixote*, and Barth says that the hero of Borges's story, Menard, "not *copies* or *imitates*, but *composes*" Cervantes's novel. Barth clearly has the notion that a parody is not an imitation but a composition:

> ...the important thing to observe is that Borges *doesn't* attribute the *Quixote* to himself, much less recompose it like Pierre Menard; instead,

> he writes a remarkable and original work of literature, the implicit theme of which is the difficulty, perhaps the unnecessity, of writing original works of literature.[15]

The negation of the originality of literature is one of the main theories of Borges as well as other writers in the Sixties, for example, Beckett — Barth admires Beckett also in the essay. Characters in Beckett's works often say, "Nothing new under the sun," or "All is known to God," which are key phrases in reading Beckett's works.[16] To Borgesian writers parody is a device used to negate the originality of literature.

Why does Barth insists that parody should not be imitation but a composition? He refers to a higher kind of imitation in which parody may be called imitation, citing Dadaism as a good example: "The imitation, like the Dadaist echoes in the work of the 'intermedia' types, is something new and *may be* quite serious and passionate despite its farcical aspect."[17] "Something new" in a work of art is important for Barth, because he considers that it is something new that contributes to the history and development of literature.

He skillfully uses the device of parody in his works, as Linda Hutcheon points out: "Barth uses parodic devices to point to the diegetic, fictive, literary elements of his fiction. He makes the artificial and the creation of it into the significant part of his literary universe."[18] Why does Barth, and most of the so-called Borgesian writers, use parody as one of their main devices in their fiction? The reason is due to the fiction of parody. Terence Hawkes mentions that parody "always uses another literary work as a background, 'takes off' that by laying bare its 'devices.'"[19] The basis of parody is not

any kind of reality but the artificial structure. Parody is an effective means of laying emphasis on the fictitiousness of literary works.

Hutcheon thinks that the etymology of the term "parody" offers the best basis for the definition of modern parody: the etymological root of the term is in the Greek noun *parodia*: the *odos* part of the word meaning song, and the prefix *para* has two meanings, "counter" or "against"—this parody becomes an opposition or contrast between texts—and "beside"—this parody is repetition with difference. "A critical distance is implied between the backgrounded text being parodied and the new incorporating work, a distance usually signaled by irony."[20] The etymological meaning of parody, "counter" or "against," is related to the very spirit of the age of the counter-culture movement in the sixties. The other meaning "beside," which produces repetition with variation is, more or less, associated with the theory of difference of Jacques Derrida, one of the central theorists in postmodern period. Commenting on parodic postmodern representation, Hutcheon argues that parody is considered central to postmodernism: "For artists, the postmodern is said to involve a rummaging through the image reverses of the past in such a way as to show the history of the representations their parody calls to our attention."[21] Parody is the root of the fictional devices of postmodernists, so that it is not too much when Hutcheon insists that parody is "a genre, rather than a technique."[22] For Barth what is parody, if it is not an imitation as he insists, and why does he use the device of parody?

For him parody is "reorchestration." In one of the Friday-pieces, "Some Reasons Why I Tell the Stories I Tell the Way I Tell Them Rather Than Some Other Sort of Stories Some Other Way," he de-

clares his spirit of an "arranger" or "orchestrator":

> At heart I'm an arranger still, whose chiefest literary pleasure is to take a received melody — an old narrative poem, a classical myth, a shopworn literary convention, a shared of my experience, a New *York Times Book Review* series — and, improvising like a jazz man within its constraints, reorchestrate it to present purpose.[23]

For him writing is orchestration, and parody is arrangement, or reorchestration, of works previously written. In another Friday-piece, "My Two Muses" lectured in 1978, he tells that he is an arranger in spirit: the essay is the confession of a failed musician whose youthful ambition was to be neither a composer not the performer, but an orchestrator — what in those big-band days was called an *arranger*. And that's my real bond with the author of the antiquity, for whom originality was chiefly a matter of rearrangement."[24] Several years after that lecture, in an interview he repeats again his confession as an arranger:

> I mentioned the word "orchestrator" a while ago. I wanted to be not a composer or writer but an orchestrator. I was far more interested in becoming an arranger than a performer or a composer. In this sense I'm frequently tended to reconstruct an old story — something to the effect of "Let's run it through again, but in another key."[25]

For him the musical terms, "reorchestration" and "arranger," are familiar because of the unrealized dream to become a musician in his youth. It is also very timely to use the word "orchestration" in the

sixties, when a noteworthy theorist of the period, M.M.Bakhtin, appears and his theories are read by most of the critics. The term "orchestration" is one of the key words of Bakhtinian theory. In his theory of heteroglossia, orchestration is the means for achieving the polyphonic novel.[26] Why do most of the experimental authors use the device of parody in postmodern period? What is the relationship between reorchestration and the conditions of literary exhaustion? In the essay "The Literature of Exhaustion" Barth quotes Borges's short story, "Pierre Menard," a parody of *Don Quixote*, as I mentioned above, and admires his skillful use of parody, but he does not mention the reason why the device of parody is important in literature. Why is the device of the parody important in literature?

Speaking about Borges's "Pierre Menard," Julio Ortega indicates that "Borges imagined the undertaking of Pierre Menard, thus suggesting that literary change is a function of reading, and that a new *Quijote* is dependent...on interpretations by which the world changes through the process of reading."[27] Parody suggests the function of reading and that reading is done by an author who lives in the future relative to when the parodied work was written. In the sense that literary history is decided by reading, reading has the power to change history in accordance with each era's new conditions. Parody shows the up-to-date reading of the parodied works and they always exist up-to-date in each age. In this sense, literature can never be exhausted, as Barth says in "The Literature of Replenishment," "its 'meaning' residing as it does in its transactions with individual readers over time, space, and language."[28] Cervantes's *Don Quixhote* can live in the age of Borges in the disguise of "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*," and in the 1980s it lives in a novel entitled the same

title as Cervantes's, *Don Quixote* written by Kathy Acker.[29] Parody is a device to show up-to-date reading. Citing Stockhausen, Hutcheon mentions that parody is a productive-creative approach to tradition, and that through parody we can hear familiar, old, performed musical material with new ears, to penetrate and transform it with a musical consciousness of today.[30] Through parody we know old material with today's eyes. For these reasons Barth explores parody in his fiction. Arts live in the time when the reader is reading them. Parody can prove this.

In 1975 Barth remarks with respect to postmodernism in the lecture, "The Spirit of Place," fumbling towards a notion of "postmodernism" and sets forth more fully in a later essay, "The Literature of Replenishment":

> ...we may regard ourselves as being not irrevocably cut off from the nineteenth century and its predecessors by the accomplishment of our artistic parents and grand parents in the twentieth, but rather as free to come to new term with both *realism* and *antirealism*, linearity and nonlineality, continuity and anything worthwhile, it describes this freedom, successfully exercised.[31]

The way of postmodernism is not to cut off but to freely maintain the relationship with the nineteenth-century. Likely parody is a means to handle old materials in modern times. The intertextual relationship goes on to create literary history. No period can ever be cut off from the preceding period. They are internally related to each other. How does postmodernism handle the former periods? How does Barth regard postmodernism as a postmodernist himself? The discussion turns to his postmodern theory in his essay "The

Literature of Replenishment."

What is postmodernism? That is the theme that Barth explores in the essay. That question inevitably has to do with another question, what the relationship between postmodernism and its preceding movement, modernism, is. Postmodernism can exist, as the term indicates, because of modernism. Concerning the historical and logical consequentiality of postmodernism Brian McHale emphasizes that "Postmodernism follows *from* modernism, in a sense, more than it follows *after* modernism," and that "there is more than mere tautology to the relation between modernism and postmodernism if we can argument about how the posterior phenomenon emerges from its predecessor — about, in other words, historical *consequentiality*."[32] We cannot make any statement about postmodernism without mentioning modernism. On the problem of the relationship between modernism and postmodernism opinion is divided into three: firstly, postmodernism is an extension of modernism, secondly it is a reaction against modernism and finally it suggests both.[33] Barth stands neutral, he argues in the essay that actual artists, actual texts, are seldom more than more or less modernist and postmodernist. In his view, the proper program for postmodernism is neither a mere extension of modernist program nor a mere intensification of certain aspects of modernism.[34] What brought postmodernism about? It can not be a mere extension of modernism. What has happened in the postmodern American period?

Postmodern society is a "mass society."[35] Technology has made rapid progress, and led to the information based society. The percentage of people who own a personal computer has increased remarkably. Post-structuralists urge "difference," pluralism, and the social

conditions of heteroglossia. People have become suspicious of the system and order around them. In his influential account of the postmodern condition, J.-F. Lyotard defines postmodernism as "incredulity toward metanarratives."[36] The chaotic condition of mass society is one of the forces that postmodernism challenges. Charles Newman regards postmodernism in terms of climax inflation: "The Post-Modern era is given both its energizing and enervating force by the *inflation of discourse*, a market which does not reach equilibrium, but only that satiety common to all systems clogged with transactions, leaving all major questions unresolved."[37] Ihab Hassan makes a division between modernism and postmodernism and argues that "modernism is largely formalist/hierarchic," on the contrary "postmodernism is antiformalist/anarchic." [38] Two tendencies in postmodernism are, according to Hassan, "indeterminacy" and "immanence."[39]

In a similar way Barth contrasts postmodernism and modernism, and searches for an answer to the question of what postmodernism is. He argues that postmodernist fiction should synthesize or transcend postmodernist and modernist modes of writing, and that the ideal postmodern novel rises above the quarrel between realism and irrealismit: it is a postmodern synthesis of all antitheses. For him the ideal postmodern work is a chaotic lexical place, where we can read heterogenius fragments. This is the reason why postmodern fiction synthesizes myth, magic, artistry, caricature, humor and terror. Authors sustain their effort by using artificial devices in their writing, tales within tales, parody, self-reference, fragmental narrative, allegory, picaresque, etc.

Barth finds the ideal postmodern works in such writers as Calvino and Márquez. In his opinion the exemplars of premodernism,

modernism, and postmodernism are, respectively, Cervantes, Borges, and Márquez. It is noteworthy that the postmodernists in American literature are influenced by Latin American authors called magic realists, who in turn are affected by the American authors from the nineteenth century such as Poe and Melville.[40] In this respect, American postmodernist authors inherit Gothic tradition in the nineteenth century through Latin American authors. Barth finds the origins of literature in *Don Quixote*, a self-transcendent parody that is a mode novel returns to for its refreshment. Historical consequentiality of the past and the present is important in any period. Hutcheon argues the importance of the interrelationship between modernism and postmodernism: "The interrogations and contradictions of...the postmodern begin with the relationship of present art and of present culture to past history."[41] In this respect, literature never exhausted. The present can be explained in terms of its relationship with the past, as well as with the future. This is suggested in McCaffery's statement that Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude* (1969) is "a model for the direction of postmodern fiction of the 1970s and 1980s."[42]

What is postmodernism? Through the examination of the relation to modernism Barth reaches the answer to that question. He concludes his essay: "What my essay 'The Literature of Exhaustion' was really about...was the effective 'exhaustion' not of language of literature, but of the aesthetic of high modernism.... In 1966/67 ...a number of us...were already well into the working out, not of the next-best thing after modernism, but of the *best next* thing: what is groupingly now called postmodernist fiction; what I hope might also be thought of one day as a literature of replenishment."[43] Post-

modern literature is a literature of replenishment. Postmodernism is a movement that replenishes modernism. This is Barth's answer to the question of what postmodernism is.

From another view point, if postmodernism effectively exhausts and replenishes modernism, postmodernism stands beyond modernism. In historical consequentiality the present always exists by consuming the past and digesting it to be born as the new age just as phoenix is consumed itself in the fire and rises renewed from the ashes to start another life. The conditions of self-involvement and at the same time beyond the self can be called a meta-condition. In this sense postmodernism is meta-modernism.

3 Fiction/Nonfiction: Barth at His Barthiest

Why is Barth's first work of nonfiction called the "Friday Book"? Because he, a fiction writer, takes a holiday, as he puts it, every Friday. While his Mondays through Thursdays are devoted to story-writing and his work as a professor in Baltimore, his Fridays are reserved for "some other sort of sentence-making, preferably nonfiction" in Maryland's Eastern Shore.[1] *The Friday Book: Essays and Other Nonfiction*, his book of essays and other nonfiction articles, is thus characteristically and aptly named. Five prefatory notes, introductory material and 37 essays and lectures are collected in this book. These 37 pieces are ordered chronologically so that the reader can follow the flow of his preoccupations from 1960 to the publication of this book. In it we read of his Fridays for nearly 25 years. At this point let me introduce the full title of the book, "THE FRIDAY BOOK, OR, BOOKTITLES SHOULD BE STRAIGHTFORWARD

AND SUBTITLES AVOIDED Essays and Other Nonfiction." His typical comical style is expressed in this long title, and there must be some trick at the bottom of it. He writes that it is a nonfiction work, then, can we see his other face, that is, not-a-novelist Barth, in *The Friday Book*? If so, what sort of Barth is revealed? In most of the Friday-pieces he develops his literary theories fully and with erudition but what kind of literary theories do we find there? His literary philosophy must hold the key to the solution of his complicated fiction al universe. What is his literary spirit? How does he compose his universe? Why does he write the stories he writes the way he writes them rather than some other way?

The reader may be surprised as he or she commences to read the book at finding five short pieces after which the Friday-pieces follow: "The Title of This Book," "The Subtitle of This Book," "Author's Introduction," "Table of Contents," and "Epigraphs." They are criticisms of this book and indeed of all books in the world. From the outset when we read the subtitle, we are put on guard: THE FRIDAY BOOK, OR, BOOK-TITLE SHOULD BE STRAIGHTFORWARD AND SUBTITLE AVOIDED. While he says subtitle should be avoided, his book carries the subtitle which is read "subtitle should be avoided." What is the purpose of this self-contradictory exercise? In a similar fashion self-contradictory statements continue with the prefatory notes and other introductory material. The first piece, "The Title of This Book," begins like this: "Book-titles should be straightforward. *Book-Titles Should Be Straightforward* is not quite straightforward...." Here he criticizes his own book title. This is not only a self directed comment but also a criticism of book-titles in general. He makes a classification of titles into three types: Self-

Referential Titles, Self-Reflexive Titles, and Self-Demonstrating Titles. "The Title of This Book" is a self-contained meta-criticism on book-titles which also includes the actual title of his own book.

In "The Subtitle of This Book" he claims that subtitles should be avoided and warns, "Say it straight" and "Get on with it," while he uses a subtitle for the very book that this piece is contained. He comments on the subtitle of his book: "*Book-Titles Should Be Straightforward* requires...the subtitle *Essays and Other Nonfiction* to make it meaningful. Sub-subtitles like *Subtitles Should Be Avoided* should be avoided if only because though fairly straightforward they necessitate a sub-sub-subtitle, in this case Essays and Other Nonfiction, which...would have been perfectly straightforward and required no subtitles."[2] Taking as an example the subtitle of *The Friday Book*, his self-reflexive comments develop into a general theory of subtitles. He continues with playful self-contradictory style in the next piece, "Author's Introduction." He gives advice to eschew introductions wherever possible. Contrary to his note that a table of contents should be straightforward, "Table of Contents" in this book is anything but straightforward. He gives a footnote that results in an intricate table of contents: that the reader cannot possibly read in a straightforward manner.

Barth's sense of humor comes to a head in this "Epigraphs"

> *...should be avoided. There is something hokey about an epigraph, even a straightforward epigraph: a posture of awe before some palimpsestic Other Text; a kind of rhetorical attitudinizing. Poshlost. It may be true, as the critic Wayne C. Booth has observed, that epigraphs and titles assume a particular importance in modernist writing, where"...they are often the only*

explicit commentary the reader is given...." *All the same, they are hokey: one more bit of window-dressing before we get the goods....*

Do not borrow epigraphs from better works than yours in hand, or from better writers than yourself.

————J. B.: "Epigraphs," in *The Friday Book*[3]

"Epigraphs" in this book is taken from " 'Epigraphs' in this book: a Barthian trick. In addition, he gives a footnote informing the reader that footnotes should be avoided: a contradiction in excess.

What he repeatedly insists on in the prefatory notes and introductory material explained above is the necessity of straightforwardness and here is the paradox that gives us pleasure in reading his works: the more repeatedly he insists on straightforwardness, the more vector of straightforwardness goes off at a tangent. It is these pieces that make up the self-contained *The Friday Book*. In most of the following Friday-pieces he refrains from criticizing criticisms, from lecturing on lectures, or from essaying on essays, that is until *The Friday Book* itself which is a maze within a maze. Take for example: "More Troll Than Cabbage: Introduction for Tape-and-Live-Voice Performances from the series *Lost in the Funhouse*," "Aspiration, Inspiration, Respiration, Expiration: Introduction to a Reading from *Chimera*," and "Doing the Numbers: A Footnote to the Foregoing": as their subtitles indicate these three Friday-pieces frame his own works, *Lost in the Funhouse, Chimera*, and the foregoing Friday-piece, "Playing for Numbers," respectively. For further examples: "Speaking of *LETTERS*" and "The Prose and Poetry of It All, or, Dippy Verse" are self-criticisms of his fictional works, *LETTERS*, and *Sabbatical*, as well as the outer frame for each fictional work.

This framing structure is a typical device in his fiction writing. Why does he use the fictional device even for *The Friday Book* which he himself calls nonfiction? Can we find another side to Barth than the fiction writer? Isn't Barth in Fridays a fiction writer? Is this book really a nonfiction work? Aren't we caught in a trap with his paradox that recalls the paradox of Cretan lie?[4] This work is a piece of Barthian fiction, not a "non-fiction" work. It is a book about books and what the reader confirms after his or her reading of the material is that the art of metafiction is the very essence of literature. All of the collected pieces in the book except the 5 joking, prefatory pieces mentioned above are introduced by new headnotes, and in each headnote he comments on the piece. What is required is a structure involving an essay about an essay or criticism, and the headnotes adopted from the collected pieces anew. The framed structure is an artistic device that exposes the reflects the apparent occupiers of the space in front of *Las Meninas* destroys the borderline between reality and fiction; reality, that is, the space of the audience outside a frame of the painting; and fiction, that is, the plane surface inside a frame of the painting.[5] Hutcheon points out that the very metafictional structure makes little of the distinction between reality and fiction: "...meta-fiction exists on the self-conscious borderline between art and life and makes little formal distinction between actor and spectator, between author and co-creating reader."[6] Metafictional structure allows us to have some doubts about the relations between reality and fiction, Patricia Waugh argues that "*Metafiction* is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality."[7]

Does the borderline between reality and fiction exist? Isn't it an illusion? Brian Stonehill's opinion supports this theory of illusion: in self-conscious novels "the fictional illusion of reality is repeatedly destroyed."[8] Reality is illusion. From the outset there are no fields that are divided into fictional field and non-fictional field: there exists only fictional field. Reality is fiction, or strictly speaking, reality is a part of fiction. Reflecting these ideas on to the relation between reality and fiction, the relation between nonfiction and fiction can be easily explained. Nonfiction which stands within reality comes under the category of fiction. Nonfiction then is paradoxically a sort of fiction.

Playing on a metafictional strategy, Barth in Fridays creates a fiction subtitled "Nonfiction." He is no more than a fictionalist. *The Friday Book* is a story by John Barth in the same sense that his seven works formerly written up to *LETTERS* comprise the story of Ambrose Mensch and *Sabbatical* is that of Fenwick Turner: noticeably, these three figures are writers. This could be the reason why a brief autobiography, "Some Reasons Why I Tell the Stories I Tell the Way I Tell Them Rather Than Some Other Sort of Stories Some Other Way," is placed first though it was written later. This is the only exception: all the other Friday pieces are ordered chronically. By placing his autobiography at the front of book, he foretells the reader that he or she is about to start reading the story of a writer named John Barth. It should be noted that he makes his start in life as a fiction writer from a library. He recollects the day when he worked in the John's Hopkins Library as an undergraduate book-filer and writes that especially he became enamored of the structure of *The Ocian of Story* by Somadeva, a tale-within-a-tale, which has an

important influence in establishing Barth's writing style. He happened to meet the book in the library, and was fascinated by it, this enabled him to start writing stories. This setting reminds us of Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*. In the introduction of the book, "The Custom-House," Hawthorne writes that when he was working as a customer in a custom house at Salem he chanced to discover the rag of scarlet cloth shaping a letter A that was so fascinating that he wrote a story entitled *The Scarlet Letter*.[9] In both cases letters begins letters. The library is a labyrinth of letters, as Barth himself says. His conception of the library as a labyrinth reminds us of a short story entitled "The Library of Babel" written by Borges, who influenced Barth greatly. [10] A library is a labyrinth, a labyrinth of letters. For Barth it is a pleasant place, where he can enjoy a "feast of narrative": "If anything ever makes a writer out of me, it will be the digestion of that enormous, slightly surreptitious feast of narrative."[11] In this sense, the library is a "funhouse", where he may get lost but can certainly spend an enjoyable time. Here is the reason why he creates his works as funhouses. While reading his works the reader may get lost in the complicated narratives, but can also enjoy his books.

As a starting place for a novelist who concerns with letters, there is no more suitable place than a library, which can be seen as a large treasure box of letters: the letters here is used in the broad sense including literature itself, as in *belles lettres*, or the alphabetical letters of which novels are constituted as combinations of atoms constitute the physical universe. What we read through *The Friday Book* is Barth at his Barthiest.

Notes

1

1. John Barth, "A Few Words About Minimalism," *New York Times Book Review*, December 28, 1986.
2. John Barth, *The Friday Book: Essays and Other Nonfiction* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1984), pp. 256–257.
3. Barth, "A Few Words About Minimalism."
4. See Herbert Read, *A Concise History of Modern Painting* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), pp. 172–173.
5. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Movements in Art Since 1945* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987), p. 12.
6. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, ed. Margaret Drabble, 5th ed. (Oxford University Press, 1985). See Suehiro Tanemura, *Magic Realism* (Tokyo: PARCO Press, 1988).
7. Lori Chamberlain, "Magicking the Real: Paradoxes of Postmodern Writing," *Postmodern Fiction: A Bio-Biblical Guide*, ed. Larry McCaffery (Greenwood Press, 1986), p. 9.
8. Chamberlain 13.
9. Chamberlain 16.
10. Jerome Klinkowitz, "Experimental Realism," *Postmodern Fiction*, ed. Larry McCaffery, p. 63.
11. Ihab Hassan, *The Literature of Silence* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1967). George Steiner, *Language and Silence* (Faber and Faber, 1985).
12. Salman Rushdie, "The Prophet's Hair," *London Review of Books*, Vol 3, No. 7 (1981). Angela Carter, "Fresh and the Mirror," Fireworks (Deborah Rogers Ltd, 1974).
13. Carol Iannone, "The Fiction We Deserve," *Commentary*, Vol 83, No. 6, June 1987.
14. Theodore Roszak, *The Cult of Information: The Folklore of Computers*

and the True Art of Thinking (Random House, 1986).

15. John Barth, *Chimera* (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1972), p. 17.
16. Tony Tanner, *City of Words* (Jonathan Cape Paperback, 1971), p. 442.
17. *Postmodern Fiction* ed. Larry McCaffery, p. xxvi.
18. Charles Newman, "What's Left out of Literature," *New York Times Book Review*, July 12 (1987).
19. McCaffery xiii.
20. Frederick R. Karl, *American Fictions 1940-1980: A Comprehensive History and Critical Evaluation* (Haper and Row, 1983), pp. 384–385.
21. John Barth, *Lost in the Funhouse* (New York: Bantam Books, 1981), p. 193.
22. Barth, *The Friday Book* 67.

2

1. Barth, *The Friday Book* 64.
2. Martina Sciolino, "Mourning, Play, and the Forms of Fiction in Europe," *Postmodern Fiction*, ed. McCaffery 150.
3. Charles B. Harris, *Passionate Virtuosity: The Fiction of John Barth* (University of Illinois Press, 1983), p. ix.
4. Tom LeClair, *The Art of Excess: Masterly in Contemporary American Fiction* (University of Illinois Press, 1989), p. 176.
5. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "The New Mood in Politics" in *The Sixties*, ed. Gerald Howard (Washington Square Press, 1982), pp. 47–48.
6. Barth, *The Friday Book* 205.
7. Barth, *The Friday Book* 66.
8. Joe David Bellamy, *The New Fiction: Interview with Innovative American Writers* (University of Illinois Press, 1974), p. 5.
9. Bellamy 3.
10. Bellamy 4.

11. Barth, *The Friday Book* 71.
12. Barth, *The Friday Book* 223.
13. Fred Moramarco, "Postmodern Poetry and Fiction" in *Postmodern Fiction*, ed. McCaffery 131.
14. Tanner 42.
15. Barth, *The Friday Book* 69.
16. Samuel Beckett, "Ping" in *Modern British Short Stories* ed. Malcolm Bradbury (Penguin Books, 1988), p. 181.
17. Barth, *The Friday Book* 72.
18. Linda Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (New York and London: Methuen, 1980), pp. 50–51.
19. Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977), p. 72.
20. Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (Methuen, 1985), p. 32.
21. Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 93.
22. Hutcheon, *The Politics* 19.
23. Barth, *The Friday Book* 7.
24. Barth, *The Friday Book* 159.
25. *Interviews With Contemporary Writers*, ed. L. S. Dembo (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), p. 326.
26. See M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* (University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 430.
27. Julio Ortega, "Postmodern in Latin America" in *Postmodern Fiction* ed. McCaffery 196.
28. Barth, *The Friday Book* 205.
29. Kathy Acker, *Don Quixote* (Grove Press, 1986). Here Don Quixote is a woman whose journey takes her from an investigation of American

history to contemporary cities.

30. Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 7.
31. Barth, *The Friday Book* 128–129.
32. Brian McHale, *Postmodernist Fiction* (Methuen, 1987), p. 5.
33. For example, Larry McCaffery stands on the first opinion, postmodernism as an extention of modernism, as he says *in Postmodern Fiction*: "there is no sharp demarcation line between what constitutes modernism and postmodernism except such arbitorary designations that critics may find useful." However, many critics, including Ihab Hassan, stands on the second opinion, i.e., postmodernism as a reaction against modernism. See *Postmodern Fiction*, ed. Larry McCaffery, p. xii, and Ihab Hassan, *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Ohio State University Press, 1987).
34. Barth, *The Friday Book* 200–201.
35. See Irving Howe, "Mass Society and Post-Modern Fiction," *Partisan Review* 26 (1959): 420–436.
36. J.-F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition* (University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. xxiv.
37. Charles Newman, *The Postmodern Aura: The Act of Fiction in an Age of Inflation* (Northwestern University Press, 1985), p. 34.
38. Hassan xiii.
39. Hassan 92.
40. See Lori Chamberlain, "Magicking the Real," pp. 8–9. And Julio Ortega, "Postmodern Fiction in Latin America" in *Postmodern Fiction in Europe and the Americans*, ed. Theo D'haen and Hans Bertens (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), pp. 193–208.
41. Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction* (New York and London: Routledge, 1988), p. 39.
42. McCaffery xxv.

43. Barth, *The Friday Book* 206.

3

1. Barth, *The Friday Book* xii.
2. Barth, *The Friday Book* xiii.
3. Barth, *The Friday Book* xix.
4. Exampling the Cretan lie paradox, Rosalie L. Colie explains paradoxicality which representation of language inevitably conceives. See Rosalie L. Colie, *Paradoxia Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox* (Princeton, 1966).
5. Silvio Gaggi, *Modern/Postmodern: A Study in Twentieth-Century Arts and Ideas* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), p. 14.
6. Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 72.
7. Patricia Waugh, *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (Methuen, 1984), p. 2.
8. Brian Stonehill, *The Self-Conscious Novel: Artifice in Fiction from Joyce to Pynchon* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), p. 3.
9. Nathaniel Hawthorne, "The Custom-House" in *The Scarlet Letter* (Ohio State University Press, 1962; rpt. 1978).
10. Jorge Luis Borges, "The Library of Babel" in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories & Other Writings* (A New Directions Book, 1964).
11. Barth, *The Friday Book* 57.